05

Presentation date: April , 2023
Date of acceptance: July 2023
Publication date: November, 2023

TEMPORAL

MARKERS IN ENGLISH AND AZERBAIJANI LANGUAGES

MARCADORES TEMPORALES EN INGLÉS Y AZERBAIYANO

Azad Yahya Mammadov[1]
E-mail: azad19622003@yahoo.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8357-1356
Samira Javanshir Mammadova[1]
E-mail: samira.mammadova@au.edu.az
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2646-8934
[1]Azerbaijan University. Azerbaijan

Suggested citation (APA, seventh ed.)

Mammadov, A. Y., & Samira Javanshir, M. (2023). Temporal markers in English and Azerbaijani languages. *Universidad y Sociedad, 15(6)*, 52-59.

ABSTRACT

In the human cognitive mechanism, there are universal ideas about time, and these ideas shape the concept of time. This concept is verbalized in discourse with the help of various linguistic units expressing temporality. In this regard, the purpose of the article is to study how the universal concept of time is verbalized with the help of temporal units in artistic discourses in English and Azerbaijani languages. The features observed in both languages are universal aspects of those language units. Discursive accented temporal units in English and Azerbaijani languages differ from discursive markers in some subtleties. The main difference is that, in contrast to discursive markers, temporal units carrying discursive emphasis are one of the components of the organization of discursive pragmatics. Temporal markers can be lexical, morphological and syntactical from the point of view of the hierarchical structure of language. In particular, it should be noted that temporal markers can be word combinations and syntactic constructions. In our study, lexical and syntactical temporal units have been selected for analysis and regardless of whether temporal markers are explicit or implicit, they can carry discursive emphasis.

Keywords: Temporal markers, discursive emphasis.

RESUMEN

En el mecanismo cognitivo humano existen ideas universales sobre el tiempo, y estas ideas dan forma al concepto de tiempo. Este concepto se verbaliza en el discurso con la ayuda de diversas unidades lingüísticas que expresan la temporalidad. En este sentido, el propósito del artículo es estudiar cómo se verbaliza el concepto universal de tiempo con la ayuda de unidades temporales en los discursos artísticos en inglés y azerbaiyano. Las características observadas en ambos idiomas son aspectos universales de esas unidades lingüísticas. Las unidades temporales discursivas acentuadas en inglés y azerbaiyano se diferencian de los marcadores discursivos en algunas sutilezas. La principal diferencia es que, a diferencia de los marcadores discursivos, las unidades temporales que llevan énfasis discursivo son uno de los componentes de la organización de la pragmática discursiva. Los marcadores temporales pueden ser léxicos, morfológicos y sintácticos desde el punto de vista de la estructura jerárquica del lenguaje. En particular, cabe señalar que los marcadores temporales pueden ser combinaciones de palabras y construcciones sintácticas. En nuestro estudio, se han seleccionado unidades temporales léxicas y sintácticas para el análisis e independientemente de si los marcadores temporales son explícitos o implícitos, pueden llevar énfasis discursivo.

Palabras clave: Marcadores temporales, énfasis discursivo.

INTRODUCTION

A language constitutes a structured mode of communication employed by specific communities or nations, encompassing phonetics, vocabulary, and syntactic rules (Robins & Crystal, 2023). This intricate and dynamic construct exhibits substantial variability contingent upon the contextual media in which it is employed. Language can be used for a variety of purposes, including conveying information, expressing emotions, and building social connections. It stands as a fundamental pillar of human culture and exercises a pivotal influence in shaping our perceptions of the surrounding world (Lupyan & Bergen, 2016). The discipline dedicated to the examination of language, recognized as linguistics, entails the scrutiny of linguistic structure, utilization, evolution, alongside the cognitive mechanisms underpinning language acquisition and utilization (Le Page, 2017; Weber, 2012).

According to Hagoort (2023), the language marker hypothesis posits that language has endowed men with a sophisticated symbolic system, which assumes a central role in the interpretation of sensory inputs, the formulation of action objectives, and the provision of a potent tool for reasoning and inference. This perspective offers a crucial correction to embodied theories of language, which run the risk of oversimplifying language by attempting to reduce it to actions, perceptions, emotions, and mental simulations (Barsalou, 2008; Pulvermüller, 2013). However, it is imperative to recognize that the relationship between these functions and language is not unidirectional since a linguistic system yields significant repercussions for both perception and action (Lupyan et al., 2020). Language imparts distinctive cognitive markers onto signals originating from perception, action, and emotional systems, thereby altering the role of these signals within the overarching cognitive framework of the human mind.

Following this hypothesis, temporal markers are linguistic elements used to create a temporal relationship between events or actions in a sentence or discourse. Temporal markers can be words, phrases, or clauses that indicate when an event occurred, is occurring, or will occur. They can be used to show the order of events, duration, frequency, or to signal a change in time (Zhang & Hudson, 2018). Temporal markers encompass lexical elements such as “yesterday,” “last month,” “tomorrow,” “before,” “after,” “meanwhile,” and “finally.” These linguistic components hold significance within language as they facilitate temporal and event-related communication. Then, the conceptosphere of time is the domain of temporality, being a monocentric functional-semantic domain that includes many concepts. It is a physical and philosophical aspect of time expressed through various linguistic means. The means of linguistic expression of temporality are grammatical, lexical and various combinative combinations. Therefore, temporality is a whole system of lexical, morphological and syntactic markers (Bondarko & Belyaeva, 1990, p. 267). The monosemanticity of temporality means that it is related to a single general semantic field: its future, present, past meanings and their various variants exist only in the context of the monosemantic field.

When classifying temporality, E. A. Ogneva (2015) defines its models as follows:

1. linear model

a) single vector.

b) multi-vector

2. nonlinear

a) one-vector

b) multi-vector

3. cyclic model

4. linear model

The majority of the mentioned models of temporality are related to the clarification and disclosure of different aspects of time by the subject and the determination of its place in the system of temporality. In his famous book “Language and Time”, Evans (2013) examines how temporality is expressed through the element of language. He focuses on the change of time, sequence relations and language tools that indicate the time on the face (for example, calendar, clock).

Another sign related to the “basic” meaning of time if found when Terpak (2018) establishes the basic meanings of time in English like: 1) The form of the existence of being: “Outside of time and space there is no movement of matter”; 2) An interval of a certain duration: “Time interval”; 3) Measure of duration (the duration of being, measured in years, days, hours, minutes, etc.): “How long will it take to complete this project?”; 4) A certain period of occupation (incident): “Time of rest”; 5) A certain moment of the day when some kind of event: “Time of train departure”; 6) The right moment to do something: “It’s time for dinner”; 7) Free period: “There is time to talk”. The mentioned basic semantics can also be attributed to the temporal units in the Azerbaijani language. Thus, the presence of such similarities in both languages is related to universal aspects in the temporal semantics of the mentioned languages (Asadov, A.2021).

Once these similarities were detected, the objective of this work is to analyze more deeply the similarities and differences in temporal markers between the English and Azerbaijani languages. For this, contrastive analysis,

descriptive and contextual analysis methods were used in the research. The contrastive analysis method made it possible to reveal the common features of temporal markers in English and Azerbaijani artistic discourse, while the descriptive method made it possible to create a general linguistic picture of facts related to both languages. On the other hand, the contextual analysis made it possible to provide an accurate linguistic analysis of temporal markers.

DEVELOPMENT

Unlike philosophical time, linguistic time studies lexical, morphological and syntactic features of time. Within the text, their nominative and functional aspects are studied and general linguistic features are investigated. Due to this aspect, linguistic tense has similar aspects in both English and Azerbaijani languages. For example, “Temporal characteristics can be conveyed by a word, phrase, and sentence. The most important role is played by adverbs of time (now, then, once, never, always, before, later, today, tomorrow, yesterday, and etc.). Thus, circumstances of time expressed by phrases are represented by several structural types (Terpak, 2018).

Explicit and implicit forms of tense have similar linguistic features in the Azerbaijani language. Sentence structure, temporality, the definition of the author according to the fineness of time in the context of the event has a subjective character. Therefore, such linguistic expression of time is also connected with national-mental characteristics. In particular, the associative expression forms of time can also be added. In the Azerbaijani thought “snow” is associated with winter (with some exceptions), but the Chukchi do not have a separate snow in the Azerbaijani sense, but it has 53 types of snow. Each of them is associated with the time of falling snow. Time is determined by the type of snow. It is worthy to note that in some of the Turkic peoples, seasonal works according to the season have a time indicator. For example, “squirrel bear” for squirrel hunting season, “cherry bear” for cherry season, and other concepts are available.

Also, the time associations related to the ship in the ancient Germanic peoples can be an example of it. As it can be seen, despite the national cultural peculiarities of the time, there are also common aspects, i.e., universal aspects, across languages. It is of theoretical importance to determine these signs on the basis of typological studies of different systematic languages. A comparative analysis of materials in this context related to other languages suggests that temporality has a universal character, despite some peculiarities of each language. In general, each language has both explicit and implicit expressions of the concept of time. An interesting aspect is to investigate cross-linguistic differences in this process. The ways in which time is implicitly verbalized especially in artistic discourse attract attention.

In both English and Azerbaijani poetic discourses, time is sometimes expressed implicitly, with various poetic artistic means. An example can be seen in example Vurgun (1948):

“The clouds are spreading in the distance, layer by layer,

The moon is rolling again in its place.

But there is neither Jalal nor Humay.

The world has no pity for age or life”.

In the example given above, “The moon is rolling again in its place” is an example of a very precise means of implicit time. Undoubtedly, the turning of the moon in its place refers only to the evening; from the point of view of temporality, it means a definite and precisely understandable time of the day. However, the lexical tense of evening is very specific and precise compared to it. The time of the moon’s rotation is determined by the reader. Its implicitness is related to it.

Reporting time by referring to some event in time models is abstract compared to the meanings of lexemes “evening”, “morning”, “afternoon. If the time “when we were in the seventh grade; from now on; before I started primary school” become specific due to some event, morning, evening, yesterday, etc. are more specific and the time is explicit (Tivyaeva, 2018). Let’s take a look at the examples (Hornbacher, 2005):

He later explained that the following year, when I was seven, the shit hit the fan. This may explain why I do not have any recollection of that year, save for vague memories of late-night screaming matches and crashing about in the dining room, when my parents returned from the theater. I was usually reading under the covers, and one night a strange stench of alcohol came from the kitchen, which I followed to find my mother pouring a number of bottles of booze down the sink. That year is a blank, aside from my seventh birthday party (I got a splinter in my nose). The next thing I remember comes a year later, when I was abruptly informed that we were moving, without apparent reason, to Minnesota.

“The following year, when I was seven”, “a year later”, the time becomes precise, free of implicitness, considering the events that preceded it. Therefore, while the explicit time is expressed by specific lexical means, the

implicit ones are arranged by means of various syntactic complexes in the artistic discourse. Now, let's take a look at the discourse related to the Azerbaijani language (Hagverdiyev, 2005, p. 22):

"The village was asleep. There was no sound from the roosters, dogs or other animals. Suddenly, a rooster crowed at the foot of the village. It occurred to me at that time that tomorrow, because of the premature crowing of this rooster, his head will be in the hands of the hangman: of course, somewhere where the people are all busy sleeping, the head of the one who raises the noise and shouts must be cut off! The full moon rose and stood in one layer of the sky, watching this scene. My old uncle suddenly got up on his knees and lowered his hat over his eyes. I guessed at once that he remembered his past days and would tell a strange story" (Asadov, A.2021).

In the given example, "The village was asleep" means "evening", "the moon rises in one layer of the sky" and "the depth of the night" as an implicit expression of time. But unlike explicit temporal markers, the temporal time indicated is relative to the text; in this context its meaning is clarified. Implicit temporal markers differ from lexical temporal markers in that they are not a lexical unit; they are created as a syntactic complex by the author according to the discourse.

Explicit time is lexical time; they have relative concreteness in the context of temporality. That's why we say relative, as we mentioned at the beginning, time adverbs are semantically abstract but they have a different level of abstraction. For example, "today" indicates a specific time rather than the moment of speaking. However, "today" can refer to different times. However, considering the moment of speaking, "today" is concrete; the conditions of concretization are the situation. The means of linguistic expression of time in English and Azerbaijani languages are characterized by their almost universal features. Let's consider these features based on the facts of English and Azerbaijani languages:

I remember everything from when we first went together.

The old man looked at him with his sun-burned, confident loving eyes.

If you were my boy I'd take you out and gamble, he said. But you are your father's and your mother's and you are in a lucky boat.

May I get the sardines? I know where I can get four baits too

I have mine left from today. I put them in salt in the box.

Let me get four fresh ones (Hagverdiyev, 2005, p. 1).

Unlike the implicit tenses given above, today is explicit; it means that the time of the event, the process takes place within a specific measure, that is, during the day. The explicitness of that language unit also consists of it. In addition, the mentioned temporal unit has an abstract feature. It is the situation that makes them concrete. For example - now, tomorrow, yesterday, the other day, next week and so on. The temporal units mentioned in English and Azerbaijani languages differ according to the degree of abstraction. "Now" marks the moment of speaking; subject indicates the time of action in the triangle of space and time. It can indicate some "now" in terms of days, weeks, months or years. Its abstractness lies in the fact that it expresses some time each time in the plural of "now". Other interesting examples would be:

"I worked the deep wells for a week and did nothing, he thought. I'll work out where the schools of bonito and albacore are and maybe there will be a big one with them. Before it was really light he had his baits out and was drifting with the current. One bait was down forty fathoms. The second was at seventy-five and the third and fourth were down in the blue" (Hemingway, 1952, p. 11).

"Mullah Sadig was moving around the room humming under the lips and rattling the large beads of his rosary quickly. He didn't teach today. He brought the children home straight from the mosque and gave each of them a broom. "We will have a guest in the evening, make home clean" he said. As if al these things were less, he kept the children until the evening and made them clean the country yard. Now everything was ready. In the next room, the wife and children were cleaning the rice, and the servants were chopping firewood. White samovars were lined up side by side on the balcony and were making noise" (Shikhli, 2005, p. 9).

In Hemingway's "The Old Man and the Sea" "now" is used as a time expressor known to the Old Man and the reader, considering the moment of the Old Man's speech. In the microtext from I. Shikhli's novel "Dali Kur", "today" marks the time of the incident, directs attention to "evening", and in this segment of the discourse, it comes to the top layer of consciousness; becomes an integral part of microtext pragmatics. Time, whether explicit or implicit, is an expression of temporality in one form or another; one is included in the dictionary and the other in the syntactic

complex. Depending on the author's intelligence, the syntactic tense model is expressed by countless syntactic complexes. They are sometimes also expressed by sentence patterns (Asadov, A.2021).

In English and Azerbaijani languages, abstraction manifests itself as the main feature of temporal units; it even becomes a special sign in time units with periodic, repeated semantics. As we know, time is continuous, repeated and constant. Philosophical time and space are in a dialectical relationship with each other. The dynamism of time is reflected in space, it manifests itself with different signs depending on the moment of speaking. Abstractness is also one of its forms of manifestation compared to concreteness. Such multifaceted semantic features of temporal units allow revealing other features not only in the example of a language, but also during their study in a typological context (Najafov, R. 2021).

For example, their function in language is multifaceted: represents the lexicon of time, creates a connection between the components of the text, plays the role of a discursive marker, as well as serves the pragmatics of the text as a discursive accent. Both the discursive marker and the discursive accent play an important role in the formation of textual pragmatics in the microtext as a segment of the macrotext. However, there is a very subtle difference between them. Discursive markers have a general marker function. The function of temporal units as a discursive emphasis is the main means of temporality regulating the discourse by penetrating into the textual pragmatics. Discourse is based on it in terms of time. This discursive sign distinguishes it from discursive markers, no matter how close it is. Then, in the microtext, the temporal unit has the function of temporal regulation in the discourse, the discursive emphasis falls on them:

1) "Your stew is excellent," the old man said.

"Tell me about the baseball," the boy asked him.

"In the American League it is the Yankees as I said," the old man said happily."

"They lost", the boy told him.

"That means nothing. The great DiMaggio is himself again."

"They have other men on the team" (Hemingway, 1952, p. 6).

2) It is said that Vurgun became Majnun,

He had an art of poetry called coy Leyla (Vurgun, 1948).

When talking about the delicious soup, the old man prefers to talk about baseball and turns the conversation to the loss of the "Yankees" in today's game. As a result, the discourse focuses on the semantics designed for that emphasis. In the given example, "now" has become the main unit of discourse pragmatics. This temporal unit, which represents the turning point of the poet's life, received discursive emphasis and became the main carrier of discourse semantics. That is, it exists as an expression of the author's life now based on new content. In the given example, "today", "now" are indicators of temporality as a discursive marker, in view, they have a marker function. However, they are located in the focus of textual pragmatics as a carrier of discursive emphasis. Discursive units, which are marked as a determining unit of the content of the discourse, are particularly different (Asadov, A.2021).

The role of the discursive emphasis in the temporal architecture of the literary text is very large. In general, the discursive emphasis is placed on the temporal unit that the discourse needs in this aspect. If we remove the words "now" or "today" in the above example, the semantics of the discourse, what it means, will not be so defined. The function of the discursive accent in the discourse is also related to it. So, the discursive accent falls on the temporal unit with an accent, which is very important for the correct presentation of the author's intention. They also play an important role in text architecture (Levchenko, 2003, p. 7). Temporal discursive accents, as we mentioned at the beginning, serve text pragmatics, they are a very important tool of unified text pragmatics with discursive emphasis.

Let's analyze other examples from Dickens (1987):

1. "It is not necessarily a lengthened preparation, being limited to the setting forth of very simple breakfast requisites for two and the broiling of a rasher of bacon at the fire in the rusty grate; but as Phil has to sidle round a considerable part of the gallery for every object he wants, and brings two objects at once, it takes time under the circumstances".
2. "He spits them out with a remorseful air, for he feels that it is in his nature to be a unimprovable reprobate and that it's no good HIS trying to keep a wake, for HE won't know no think".
3. "I hope, "I think I added, without very well knowing what I said, "that you will now go away as if you had been so exceedingly foolish and attend to Mrs. Kengeand Carboy's business.
4. Can there come fog too thick, can there come mud and mire too deep, to assort with the groping and floundering condition which this High Court of Chancery, most pestilent of hoary sinners, holds this day in the sight of heaven and earth.

In the given examples, "never" collapsed into textual pragmatics with the semantics of impossibility. In all of the above examples, this code has a defining feature. The leadership of that temporal unit as a discursive emphasis is also characterized by it. In other words, possibility and impossibility become the general semantic determinant of the discourse by accepting the discursive emphasis of the microtext, in which "never" participates as a time indicator in the always-never antithesis. Let's look at an example of the Azerbaijani language:

"The door opened. One of Goytepe's famous murids entered. He bowed respectfully to Hadji. Then he sat down on one of the mats. Afterwards, the door was opened and closed quickly, and the number of pairs of shoes on the threshold increased. Gradually, it was filled with bearded men, and the embroidered socks of those sitting on the mattresses lined up along the wall were lined up like soldiers standing in order" (Shikhli, 2005, p. 159).

In this microtext, the temporal marker "Afterwards" indicates the time of the beginning and acceleration of events as one of the main features of textual pragmatics. Therefore, the discursive emphasis falls on it; because the events are based on it in terms of time. Therefore, the temporal markers that rise to the level of discursive emphasis gain discursive functionality in the context of the text in addition to nominative. That event becomes the main component of textual pragmatics as "beginning" in the presented literary text. In this regard, the temporal marker "yesterday" is also interesting. Let's continue with examples from in Dickens (1987):

1. "Richard, anxious to a tone for his thoughtlessness of good-naturedly explained that Miss. Jelly by was not connected with the suit.
2. "To see that composed court jogging on so serenely and to think of the wretchedness of the pieces on the board gave me the headache and the heartache both together.
3. "His successor is in my house now- in possession, I think he call sit. He came on my blue-eyed daughter's birthday.
4. Today she is at Chesney World; she was at her house in town; to-morrow she may be abroad, for anything the fashionable intelligence can with confidence predict.
5. Now do they show (in as many words as possible) how during some hours of evening a very peculiar smell was observed by the inhabitants of the court, in which the tragical occurrence which forms the subject of that present account transpired; and which odor was at one time so powerful that Mr. Swills, a comic vocalist professionally engaged by Mr. J.G.
6. Not in the least anxious or disturbed is Mr. Bucketwhen Sir Leicester appears, but he eyes the baronet side as he comes slowly to his easy chair with that observant gravity of yesterday in which there might have been but for the audacity of the idea, a touch of compassion.

The processes that occur in life take place within a certain time and space; their non-existence outside of time and space has a special effect on their function in discourse; that is, it makes it an integral part of pragmatics in discourse. Because, the time of the event is important for the discourse in all cases. In the above examples, "yesterday" characterizes the importance of the given information from the point of view of time, and the discursive emphasis determines their informative value for the discourse. The value of yesterday's event for today can be not only in its informativeness, but also in its result. In that case, the events are the cause, and those who derive from it gain the value of the result. The mentioned point makes it necessary to say the temporal unit with special emphasis and makes it a very important component of textual pragmatics. Let's look at an example of the Azerbaijani language:

"Two horsemen appeared in front of Karbalayi Gasim in the countryside. They were riding their horses speedily. Except of them, you can't see anything on the road. But after a while, a group of horsemen came out from behind the trees near "Maryazya". Among them, chief patron and bailiffs' clothes and ladies' hats were clearly visible. Karbalayi Gasim quickly went downstairs, came to the lady in a hurry and said:

- Madam, these are yesterday's quests.

- The lady put on her headscarf and came to Karbalai Gasim and said:

- What are yesterday's guests doing here?

Karbyalayi Gasim he put his arms on top of each other and answered:

- What should I know, Madam?

At that time noise broke out in the street (Asadov, A. 2021). The barking of dogs, the running of people, the trampling of horses. A mi- nute later the outdoor was knocked. The lady went inside and looked at the street, and saw that the street was full of riders; all Russian maids and Russian ladies. Karbalayi Gasim went out to speak and saw that yesterday's all guests in the bailiff's house had come and stood in

front of the door". In such a case, "yesterday" becomes the top layer of the information given in the discourse (Mammadguluzade, 2004, p. 190).

In the given text, "yesterday's" means a time-event association related to the events that happened yesterday. In order to understand the events that happened in that microtext, it is necessary to know what happened yesterday. Therefore, discursive emphasis falls on that temporal marker. As a result, that temporal marker becomes one of the main carriers of textual pragmatics. This feature can also be attributed to other temporal units such as and so on. For example (Dickens, 1987):

1. Early I help her to tidy her room and clean her birds, and I make her cup of coffee for her (of course she taught me), and I have learnt to make it so well that Prince says it's the very best coffee he ever tasted, and would quite delight old Mr. Turvey drop, who is very particular indeed about his coffee.
2. "Richard told me-". He falters. "I mean, I have heard of this- don't mind I will speak presently".
3. Mr. Bagnet, being deeply convinced that to have a pair of fowls for dinner is to attain the highest pitch of imperial luxury, invariably goes forth himself very early of this day to buy a pair. He is, as invariably, taken in by the vendor and installed in the possession of the oldest inhabitants of any coop in Europe (Asadov, A. 2021).

In the first example, "in the morning" (early in the morning) means cleaning the room and taking care of the birds, in the second example, "me for a moment" means coming to mind, and in the third example, "in the morning" means the time of what he fears in the morning. As each time marker has its own semantics, their acceptance of discursive emphasis depends on the appropriate choice of information given by the author in relation to time in the discourse. The essence of the choice is the correct determination of the role of the temporal unit depending on the way the time is given. For example, "morning" in one of the given information, "early in the morning" in one and "for a moment" in the other becomes relevant. The actualization means that the mentioned temporal units are an integral part of textual pragmatics. Let's look at an example of the Azerbaijani language (Hagverdiyev, 2005):

"At one of beautiful nights, we put a couch in front of a house and on one side, I and my uncle, who served in the age of Emperor Nicholas I, sat down and rested. The blowing of the breeze, the chirping of the grasshoppers' wings and the songs of the frogs of the nearby ditch all mixed together and created a strange harmony that calmed the soul. The grain sown in the plains lay in front of the breeze and rippled like a river, and the full spikes lowered their oppressed heads, waiting for the reapers who were their only executioners like criminals ordered to be killed. One by one, the empty spikes raised their heads and looked proudly at the others. But they were wrong, they would not be able to escape from the hands of the executioner. But a full head would be cut off more than an empty head. At the end of the plain where the grain was harvested, the sound of the small river could be heard immediately, and they had put a guard on the spikes, as if they had grown in a row on the edge of the river" (Najafov, 2021).

The temporal marker "at one of the beautiful nights" distinguishes that night from the others from the point of view of the event to be told, and discursive emphasis is placed on it. Because the event to be told is related to that night. The attitude towards that event becomes the main component of textual pragmatics. The basis of the microtext is "that night". Therefore, that event, which is very important for the information in the text, is narrated at "one of the beautiful nights". When talking about the time of the event, the executioner's hands are used to "cut off the head' and the victims of the event are the same, and the time both of them are mentioned, is "one of the beautiful nights". Therefore, "one of the beautiful nights" comes to the top of the information in the microtext by adopting a discursive emphasis.

CONCLUSIONS

Temporal markers play an important role in the pragmatic organization of the discourse and become its component. This happens when the discursive emphasis is placed on that temporal unit. Discursive accent differs from other accents in the language in that it belongs to an integral part of discourse pragmatics that carries information. If the discursive markers existing in the language are considered an indicator of pragmatics, the unit carrying discursive emphasis is a component of discursive pragmatics, becoming relevant in the context of discourse. This typologically defined feature has universality and is important in discourse theory (Asadov, A.2021).

Although temporal markers are minority language units in the lexicon of both languages, it can be seen from the given examples that they have a very important role in the discourse context. On the one hand, they are expressed by words and word combinations, on the other hand, by various syntactic constructions. Undoubtedly, the function and activity of temporal syntactic constructions in discourse does not lag behind lexical and other syntactic units; each of them has its own place and corresponding function in the discourse during information delivery.

REFERENCES

Asadov, A. (2021). Organizational issues of work on world literature samples in primary schools. Journal of Preschool and Primary Education, 236(3), 81–93.

Asadov, A. (2021). The role of world literature in shaping students' planetary thinking. Azerbaijan Journal of Educational Studies, 697(4), 111–119.

Barsalou, L. W. (2008). Grounded Cognition. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *59*(1), 617–645. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.59.103006.093639

Bondarko, A. V., & Belyaeva, E. I. (1990). *Theory of Functional Grammar*. Nauka.

Dickens, C. (1987). *Bleak House*. Oxford University Press.

Evans, V. (2013). *Language and Time: A Cognitive Linguistics Approach* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Hagoort, P. (2023). The language marker hypothesis. *Cognition*, *230*, 105252. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2022.105252

Hagverdiyev, A. (2005). The Testimony of the Moon. In *Abdurrahim Bey Hagverdiyev Selected Works* (Vol. 2). Leader Publishing House.

Hemingway, E. (1952). *The Old Man and the Sea*. Literary Fiction.

Hornbacher, M. (2005). *Wasted: A Memoir of Anorexia and Bulimia*. HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.

Le Page, R. B. (2017). The Evolution of a Sociolinguistic Theory of Language. In *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (pp. 13–32). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405166256.ch1

Levchenko, M. N. (2003). *Temporal-Local Architectonics of Literary Texts of Various Genres*. Science.

Lupyan, G., Abdel Rahman, R., Boroditsky, L., & Clark, A. (2020). Effects of Language on Visual Perception. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *24*(11), 930–944. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2020.08.005

Lupyan, G., & Bergen, B. (2016). How Language Programs the Mind. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, *8*(2), 408–424. https://doi.org/10.1111/tops.12155

Mammadguluzade, Dj. (2004). *Gurbanali Bey* (Vol. 1).
Ondar Publishing House.

Najafov, R. N. (2021). The problem of deviantism and its essence. Zien Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 1(1), 96–103.

Ogneva, E. A. (2015). The Temporal Cognitive Grid of the Literary Text: Tendencies of Cross-cultural Adaptation. *Modern Science and Education Issues*, *1*(3), 70–76.

Pulvermüller, F. (2013). Semantic embodiment, disembodiment or misembodiment? In search of meaning in modules and neuron circuits. *Brain and Language*, *127*(1), 86–103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2013.05.015

Robins, R. H., & Crystal, D. (2023). Language. In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. https://www.britannica.com/topic/language

Shikhli, I. (2005). *Selected Works* (Vol. 2). East-West.

Terpak, M. A. (2018). Spatial and temporal specificity of professional textual discourse in English and Russian languages. *News of the Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Social, Humanities, Medical and Biological Sciences*, *20*(3 (60)), 54–59. https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/ prostranstvennaya-i-temporalnaya-spetsifika- professionalnogo-tekstovogo-diskursa-v-angliyskom- i-russkom-yazykah

Tivyaeva, I. (2018). Temporal Adverbials as Elements of the Verbal Code Representing the Mnemonic Function. *Bulletin of Volgograd State University. Episode 2. Linguistics*, *17*(1), 124–133. https://doi.org/10.15688/ jvolsu2.2018.1.13

Vurgun, S. (1948). *The World*. Light.

Weber, K. H., Jean-Jacques. (2012). What is a language? In *Introducing Multilingualism*. Routledge.

Zhang, M., & Hudson, J. A. (2018). The Development of Temporal Concepts: Linguistic Factors and Cognitive Processes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*. https://doi. org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02451